

This facsimile message and its contents are legally privileged and confidential information intended solely for the use of the addressee. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, copying or other use of this message and its contents is strictly prohibited. If you have received this telecopy in error, please notify us immediately by telephone and return the original message to us at the address shown below via the Postal Service. Thank You.

# ALSTON & BIRD LLP

101 South Tryon Street, Suite 4000  
Charlotte, NC 28280-4000  
704-444-1000  
Fax: 704-444-1111

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER  
FEB 09 2005

## TELECOPY

PLEASE DELIVER AS SOON AS POSSIBLE

Date:

February 9, 2005

Recipient:

Examiner A. Rudy

Company:

UNITED STATE PATENT AND  
TRADEMARK OFFICE

Fax Number:

703-872-9306

Voice Number:

Recipient Tel Number

Sender:

W. Kevin Ransom

Message:

### \*\*\*\*\* OFFICIAL FILING \*\*\*\*\*

Appl. No.:	09/438,957	Confirmation No.:	1078
Applicant(s):	Terrell B. Jones		
Filed:	November 12, 1999		
Art Unit:	3627		
Examiner:	A. Rudy		
Title:	DEMAND AGGREGATION AND DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM		

Number of Pages: (including cover page)

**IF NOT RECEIVED PROPERLY, PLEASE NOTIFY US IMMEDIATELY AT.**

USER CODE:	RANSK	REQUESTED BY:	Kevin Ransom
CLIENT/MATTER:	023895/257368	OPERATOR:	

CLT01/4689798v1

PATENT

RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. 1.116 - EXPEDITED  
PROCEDURE - EXAMINING GROUP 3600

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Appl. No.: 09/438,957 Confirmation No.: 1078  
Applicant(s): Terrell B. Jones  
Filed: November 12, 1999  
Art Unit: 3627  
Examiner: A. Rudy  
Title: DEMAND AGGREGATION AND DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM

Docket No.: 023895/257368  
Customer No.: 00826

Mail Stop AF  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER  
FEB 09 2005

RESPONSE AFTER FINAL ACTION  
PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 1.116

Sir:

This correspondence is filed in response to the Office Action dated December 27, 2004. Applicant first notes with appreciation, the Examiner's continued thorough examination of the application as evidenced by the Office Action. In response to the Office Action, Applicant has not amended the claims. Specifically, Applicant submits that the claims, as presently presented, are patentable over the cited references. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the claims in light of the remarks presented below.

I. Summary of Rejections

The Office Action rejects all of the pending claims, namely Claims 1-9 and 23-34, as obvious in light of the combination of U.S. Patent No. 6,230,146 to Alaia and U.S. Patent No.

Appl. No.: 09/438,957  
Arndt. dated 02/09/2005  
Reply to Office action of December 27, 2004

6,418,415 to Walker. Specifically, the Office Action alleges that the '146 Alaia patent discloses aggregating demand for an item from a user and the '415 Walker patent discloses aggregating requests from different users for one or more of the same items. The Office Action alleges that "to have provided aggregating requests for one or more of the same items disclosed by Alaia would have been obvious in light of Walker."

## II. Claims 1-9 Are Patentable

Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner's proposed combination overlooks a important element of the independent Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, and 8, namely the recitation that aggregation of information for an item from different users is "independent of a commitment by the remote users to purchase the item." Every reference cited by the Examiner that relates to aggregation of information for an item from different users requires that the users be committed to purchase the item prior to aggregation.

Specifically, the '415 Walker patent clearly requires that the user commit to purchase when submitting the bid. The reference is replete, including even the title, with the requirement that the user commit to purchase prior to aggregation of the user's request with other users' requests. For example, in the abstract of the '415 Walker patent, it states that "the buyer is bound on behalf of the accepting seller."

In previous Office Actions, the Examiner has also cited U.S. Patent Number 6,260,024 to Shkedy, which discloses aggregation of requests from different users for an item. As pointed out in previous responses, the '024 Shkedy patent also requires that the user be committed to purchase prior to aggregation. For example, at col. 2, lines 52-58, the '024 Shkedy patent states that it is impossible to guarantee a price for the item if the consumer is not committed to purchase the item.

The Office Action's current combination fails to explain this problem with the art. It appears that the Office Action is picking and choosing which part of each reference to use in making the combination. Specifically, it appears that the Office Action wishes to combine the "aggregation of requests from multiple users" aspects of the '415 Walker and '024 Shkedy patents, with the "return of multiple pricing options" of the '146 Alaia patent. More specifically,

Appl. No.: 09/438,957  
Amtd. dated 02/09/2005  
Reply to Office action of December 27, 2004

the Office Action argues that such a combination would be obvious to one skilled in the art. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this contention.

There is nothing within the cited references to teach or suggest that a system for aggregating requests from different users could be implemented where the aggregation of different users' requests is performed "independent of a commitment by the remote users to purchase the item," as is recited in independent Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, and 8. The '146 Alaia patent clearly does not disclose aggregation of different users' requests. The reference merely shows aggregation of different items, such as pencils and paper, all requested by only one user. Further, the '415 Walker and '024 Shkedy patents, which disclose aggregation of requests from different users, both specifically require commitments by the user prior to aggregation. The '146 Alaia patent does not deal with aggregation of request from various users, and thus, provides no teaching or suggestion of allowing the aggregation to occur independent of a commitment by the users to purchase, and the '415 Walker and '024 Shkedy patents specifically require a commitment before aggregation.

Applicant submits that it is not enough to say that two references can be combined. In order to sustain a prima facie case under § 2143 MPEP, it must be shown that the combination meets each element of the claim. In this regard, the two cited references do not teach or suggest aggregation of different users' requests is performed "independent of a commitment by the remote users to purchase the item," as is recited in independent Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, and 8. The '415 Walker and '024 Shkedy patents specifically require a commitment before aggregation, and as such, if the references were combined, the combination would also require such a commitment, as there is no teaching or suggestion contrary to this requirement in the '415 Walker and '024 Shkedy patents. Therefore, the combination would not meet the claims.

In light of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1-9 are patentable.

## II. Independent Claims 29-31 Are Patentable

Independent Claims 29-31 recite that the users are provided with at least two responses from which to choose from. Applicant submits that this is not taught or suggested by the cited combination. Specifically, as discussed above, the cited combination requires that the user be

Appl. No.: 09/438,957  
Amdt. dated 02/09/2005  
Reply to Office action of December 27, 2004

committed to purchase of the item prior to the system attempting to aggregate and get a bid. As such, the combination would not provide the consumer with two or more responses to choose between. The combination will only provide one bid, which the user must accept. If it provided two separate results, the user would not be committed to acceptance of one result, as the user could select between the results. This is inconsistent with a commitment to purchase, as is required in both the '415 Walker and '024 Shkedy patents.

### III. Independent Claims 32-34 Are Patentable

Independent Claims 32-34 recite that the system attempts to get bids for an order independent of setting a maximum price and receives bids from suppliers, where the price set by the supplier for the item is independent of maximum price set by the consumer. The system of Claims 32-34 is advantageous in that it allows the consumer to check pricing for the request without having to first commit to a maximum price. Specifically, under the prior art systems, the consumer must input a maximum price at the outset. This is some ways may tip the consumer's hand. Specifically, the supplier is then aware of the consumer's maximum price and may seek to set their price just below or at the maximum price, even though the seller may have been willing to sell the item for less. Further, by not requiring a maximum price, the consumer may have access to price quotes from sellers that are above a maximum value that the consumer would have set. For example, under the conventional system, a consumer will not see an offering from a seller that may only be a couple of dollars higher than the maximum bid, which the consumer may have considered if she/he had known about the offer. Under the claimed system, the consumer can see all bids and make a decision based on the knowledge of all bids.

Applicant respectfully submits that none of the cited references, taken either individually, or in combination, teaches or suggests the following recitations of the Claims 32-34:

providing aggregated information to a plurality of suppliers, each capable of supplying the item without also providing remote user identification information from the request, wherein said providing step provides the aggregated information to the suppliers independent of any predetermined maximum price for the items;